AT CHRISTMAS TIME... **HUMAN EVENTS is the most appreciated of all gifts—**

See Page 463 for an Important New Gift Offer

LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVII, No. 39 September 29, 1960 Section I — News

IKE: *Concerned with economic problems* .....(449)

DICK: *A pro on the campaign trail* .....(449)

TEXAS: *Longhorn Catholics like Nixon* .....(450)

UN: *Many urge its relocation* .....(450)

CUBA: *Who were Fidel's US backers?* .....(451)

Ike Studies Business: On Tuesday, September 10, at 10 a.m. in the White House, Ike faced up to the problem of the mediocre business climate in the country. He met with heads of the Federal Reserve Board, Treasury officials, economic advisers, some bankers. The White House press section passed off the meeting as merely "routine." Actually it was more than that, according to an exclusive report relayed to HUMAN EVENTS.

The President expressed himself as concerned and puzzled over the Stock Market slide which had occurred the day before. But he was informed by his advisers that the visit of Khrushchev to New York has had only a very negligible influence on the market. They stressed that the prices of many shares had been too high and that the mixed picture of business prospects in months ahead was bound to have a market reaction.

The nub of the business problem, Ike was told, was the fact that industry needs more orders coming in. It was pointed out that there is approximately $11 billion appropriated and authorized for the Pentagon, but not yet committed. Why should not some part of this be released now in orders to industry? It was remarked that in recent weeks orders to missile and aircraft firms have been stepped up. Why not more? There followed discussion of possibly good psychological effects as a result of opening the Pentagon pipe lines.

Ike played with an idea that he might call a meeting of business and banking leaders. But no decision was made, according to our information.

One economic adviser stressed the factor of the flight of American industry and investment abroad. He said that one New York investment house recently bought a quarter of a billion dollars worth of shares of Japanese common stock. Ike, startled, exclaimed, "My God." All this entered into a discussion of the problem of the flight of gold from the US.

It is known that, in its effort to solve the "outflow of gold" problem, the Government is seriously considering a plan resembling a policy instituted by the British Government in its gold troubles in the early 1930's. The US plan would require that all money loaned or granted to countries or companies abroad must be spent in the US in orders to US industrial firms.

All the above suggest that Ike is by no means exclusively preoccupied with foreign policy. All signs indicate that he wants to leave office as a living symbol not only of "peace," but also of "prosperity."

Nixon: Newsmen who are accompanying the Vice President on his campaign tours stopped off briefly in Washington last week and spoke favorably, with their friends on Capitol Hill, about the GOP candidate's technique. They denied that Nixon had reverted to the "high level" type of campaign, which proved fatal in 1948, and emphasized that the Republican candidate constantly has in mind Dewey's mistakes of that year as he pursues some highly un-Dewey-like policies.

For instance, Nixon energetically woos the GOP leaders wherever he stops, boosts them in his speeches, helpfully extols local Republican candidates in his utterances and leaves behind an enthusiastic morale, which should pay off well in the elections. Dewey, it is recalled, habitually snubbed or brushed off the local boys and probably lost the close '48 contest for that reason alone. This phase of Nixon's campaigning is little noticed in wire service reports, but its importance, say political pros, cannot be overemphasized.

Nor—according to the accompanying newsmen—is the GOP candidate as "high level" as some political commentators say. He stepped up his attacks on Kennedy in the past two weeks, strived to show how different he is from the Massachusetts man. Addressing the Machinists Union leaders in St. Louis, he quoted the Democratic candidate as saying in Detroit: "What the American labor movement wants for America is what I want for America, and what the American labor movement opposes, I oppose." In marked contrast, Nixon told the labor meeting he would refuse to sell himself to the union bosses and go along with their every command. He got no cheers from the labor skates, but newsmen

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

felt he gained political mileage with the general public, which is fed up with the power of the Labor Boss oligarchy. "An act of rare political courage," said the Chicago *Tribune*.

Finally, in his enthusiastically received Minneapolis speech on September 17, the Vice President literally "threw the book" at Kennedy, accusing him of "endlessly forecasting doom and prating gloom," of trying to "scare people." Nixon obviously seeks to pin the label of "selling America short" on his opponent. This is quite a different posture from that of Dewey in 1948.

The Second Big Payoff: The mobilization of Big Labor's political action arm to register voters is viewed apprehensively by GOP pros in Washington. They call it the "second big payoff" by Walter Reuther and associates to Senator Kennedy for his cooperation with them in fighting labor reform legislation on Capitol Hill, and for his attempt to mute the efforts of Senators Goldwater, Mundt and Curtis to expose Reuther's bloody strike methods before the Senate Rackets Committee.

The first big payoff took place at the Democratic national convention in Los Angeles, where the labor bosses and their controlled delegates ensured the nomination of Senator Kennedy. The second payoff, now under operation, may well ensure the election of the Massachusetts man. For COPE, the political shock troops of the labor union power, has immensely augmented its resources and know-how since the last Presidential campaign, as was shown by its success in the off-year congressional campaign of 1958, when the Republicans were snowed under. Justifiably, the Republican organization is worried.

Today, in typically astute COPE fashion, the labor high command has proclaimed a "bi-partisan" drive for registration of non-registered voters—"register for the party of your choice," etc., etc. Actually, it is nothing of the sort. Paid COPE agents, paid for every name they add to the rolls, cover a city block and ask the unregistered whether they will register Democratic or Republican; a follow-up gets the Democrats to the places of registration and ignores the Republicans.

Next, the COPE machine reportedly plans to exploit similar deceptive formulae, such as it did in previous elections. The labor agents compile lists of "potential voters" by combing the city directories and comparing these lists with lists of registered voters. Then the laborites go through the lists and cross out all names of professional men and women, business executives, salesmen, supervisors, foremen, etc. (in short, all persons unlikely to be susceptible to labor union propaganda and therefore not inclined to vote Democratic).

Such culled lists are useful in that the labor bloc groups can concentrate on the most likely Democratic voter material in their bell-pushing activities and in their mail distribution of leaflets. But the most important advantage lies in the fact that these "edited lists" in the past have been handed over to impartial, public-spirited groups, foundations and boy scout troops which urge the electorate to "go to the polls."

Texas Story: The Catholic Bishop of Dallas and Fort Worth, a Democrat, is portrayed as a Nixon supporter and as carrying with him most of the Catholic hierarchy and priesthood, not to mention many of the 1,780,000 Catholics in Texas—in a sensational story last week in the New York *Herald-Tribune*. This account has surprised Capitol Hill which recently has been inclined to concede almost all of the "Catholic Vote" to Kennedy—because of an anticipated Catholic reaction against the anti-Kennedy campaign, waged on religious grounds, by Protestant clergymen.

According to the *Herald-Tribune* correspondent, Robert S. Bird, Bishop Thomas K. Gorman, head of the Dallas-Fort Worth Diocese, gives his unofficial "support" to Nixon, and this is "freely acknowledged by his associates and generally known to the public."

Reports Bird: "Most of the Catholic hierarchy here are, in fact, on the Nixon side, and probably most of the Catholic clergy in Texas are planning to vote the Nixon ticket, according to Catholic clerical informants whom I interviewed."

According to a diocesan spokesman interviewed by Bird, some Catholics in Dallas expressed resentment of Senator Kennedy's frank talk in Texas. The Senator has "put himself on trial" and placed the church "in a position to be judged." The Catholic Church "needs no defense in regard to the loyalty of members of the Church." So ran this Catholic reaction against Kennedy's handling of the touchy matter in his Texas speech.

The New York *Herald-Tribune* correspondent describes these conservative Catholics for Nixon in Texas: "Though deploring the extravagant and often vicious anti-Catholic propaganda, these Texas Catholics say they will not take personal offense at it in the heat of the campaign and thereby throw their vote to Senator Kennedy. To do that, they say, would mean yielding to emotionalism, whereas the issues call for rational thinking and rational voting —for Mr. Nixon."

Says Bird: The paradox of this picture—of Catholics opposing Kennedy for his "liberalism," while Southern Baptists attack his Catholicism—"may serve as a straw in the wind for other parts of the country."

Move the UN? Heretofore the few who cried "Let's get the United Nations out of the United States" were dismissed with a sophisticated yawn by the organization's "liberal" champions. But with the advent of the unruly, dictator-ridden session now in progress, many seasoned political and diplomatic heads are taking a second look at this suggestion.

Doris Fleeson, "liberal" columnist and friend of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the UN, wrote last week: "At this point most members of Congress would gladly vote funds to move the UN to Switzerland, a more limited and quieter center of world communications . . . ." From the diplomatic ranks strongly anti-Communist John C. Wiley, a veteran foreign service officer who served as charge d'affaires in Berlin and Moscow, wrote the New York *Times*: "Manhattan is clearly not suitable to serve as a foreign enclave for a United Nations city. This is therefore a strong argument for removing the UN from New York." Wiley made it clear that he thought the UN would be better off outside the US.

Perhaps the most impressive voice calling for the UN to be moved out of the country was an editorial in the Scripps-Howard papers last week. Seconding the nomination of Switzerland as the world organization's new home, Scripps-Howard said: "By all means relocate UN headquarters. Both the UN and the US would be better off. The money New York is spending in overtime for its policemen would make a fair-sized down payment on the moving bill."

HUMAN EVENTS last week suggested that all concerned might be better off were the UN to move to a neutral island (which, in effect, Switzerland is). As for the financial feasibility of moving the UN to another location, William Zeckendorf, Sr., president of Webb & Knapp and one of the country's leading real estate men, told HUMAN EVENTS: "An excellent piece of real estate. If it reverted to the United States government and was then offered to private interests it would become one of the most valuable pieces of real estate in the world."

No Kid Stuff: Can America afford to overlook the old adage—**don't send a boy to do a man's job**—in this powderkeg era? This question rose sharply last week as the wily and ruthless Nikita Khrushchev strutted around the UN.

Compounding the image of Democratic Presidential nominee Jack Kennedy as one lacking the maturity to deal with Russia's tyrant was his conduct on the Senate floor May 23, after Senators Dirksen and Scott, two expert "needlers," scored Jack for his U-2 "apology" remarks to a high school audience in St. Helen's, Oregon, on May 18. Dirksen read into the record a story from the Portland *Oregonian* which quoted Kennedy as saying: "I think that might have been possible to do" in answer to a question on whether Ike should have apologized to Khrushchev for the U-2 incident.

The two Republicans had Kennedy in an excited huff as he took the floor to give an account of the St. Helen's interview. Getting to the question of the U-2, Kennedy said (p. 10049, May 23 Congressional Record): "The next question is not recorded, (the school principal's) recollection was—and the answer—and the answer I gave would seem to be responsive to it—that it was: 'What would you have done if you had been President Eisenhower?' My response was: 'Once the summit had been broken up and once Mr. Khrushchev indicated his refusal to continue I don't think that the United States could—but—he said there were two conditions for continuing. One, that we apologize. That might have been possible to do . . . ."

It is now asked: "If Jack Kennedy lacks the maturity to keep his balance and remain unruffled in give and take sessions within the confines of his 'club,' the US Senate, how would he fare against the combative needling of Khrushchev in a situation where all the chips were down?"

Cuba: Castro's antics in New York scarcely suggest any gratitude towards the US Government which helped him to power. Last week Capitol Hill noted with interest testimony released by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee which confirms the judgment that HUMAN EVENTS was the first to render on January 14, 1959: "Fidel Castro is in power today because the US Government put him there," as a result of the policies shaped by "elements in the State Department" which staged "a small-scale repetition of the sellout of China." Two former Ambassadors to Cuba—Arthur Gardner and Earl E. T. Smith—recently testified to the Subcommittee that this had taken place.

Both—under questioning from Senators Eastland, Dodd and Hruska—laid major responsibility on Assistant Secretary of State Roy Rubottom and head of the Caribbean desk William Wieland for a policy aimed at ousting Batista and putting Castro in power. Smith also mentioned "certain members" of Congress, the CIA and other agencies of the US Government, as well as Herbert L. Matthews of the New York *Times*. Gardner served in Havana from 1953 until June, 1957 (six months after Castro landed in Cuba), when Smith took over as Ambassador. Both agreed that early in 1957, before the Castro movement got rolling, Cuba enjoyed unparalleled prosperity.

Gardner told the Subcommittee that he tried but was unable to alert the State Department to the danger of Castro's taking over. He had repeatedly stressed that Batista was a friend of this country. Smith said he advised State that it was not in the best interest of the US that Castro take power; he reported that Castro was a Marxist and that Communist influences were in his movement. Smith testified that he had objected to the State Department's embargo on munitions to Cuba, which, he said, contributed greatly to Batista's downfall and Castro's triumph. As to the responsibility of the State Department, Smith's remarks on the State bureaucrats led Senators Eastland and Dodd to conclude in a joint statement:

HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM, Member of Congress from Georgia: "I believe HUMAN EVENTS to be one publication that always gives careful analysis to the events and issues of the day and I always look forward to receiving it and having the opportunity to study the views presented in it."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"American foreign policy is not made in the office of Secretary Herter on the fifth floor of the State Department. It is made on the fourth floor by the unknown policy planners who fill the Secretary's 'in' basket. Secretary Herter, the man on the quarter deck, is not in charge of the ship."

This process, by which policy of the "top" is shaped by the lower echelons of the Department, has often been mentioned in these columns.

Recognition of this situation—heightened by revelations made by Gardner and Smith—prompt many in the Capital to urge an immediate purging of such elements, before more damage is done. Recently, HUMAN EVENTS reported sentiment for replacement of the ailing Secretary of State Herter by former Governor Dewey for an emergency clean-up job.

Kennedy in Ohio: Liberal syndicated columnist Joseph Alsop recently wrote of "startling good news for Senator John F. Kennedy and proportionately bad news for Vice President Nixon" in the agricultural Midwest. The proof of Alsop's assertion: A 46-person poll taken by Alsop in Ohio townships that allegedly showed large numbers of Eisenhower supporters switching to Kennedy.

The area's largest newspaper, however, conducted a much larger poll, contacting six times as many voters, and found that Nixon would carry rural Ohio "by a landslide." The Ashtabula *Star Beacon* found Nixon equalling Eisenhower's record 1956 percentage, and running ahead of Ike's 1952 vote. The *Star-Beacon* poll, taken by three veteran reporters, found no evidence of "farmer discontent" and discovered large numbers of "old-line conservative Democrats" flocking to Nixon.

Panama: Congressional reaction last week to Ike's action in having the Panama Republic flag fly coequal with the Stars and Stripes in the Canal Zone was led by Senator Styles Bridges, Senior Republican in the US Senate. The New Hampshire Senator said the announcement "not only surprises me, but shocks me deeply," adding that our "currently strong position in Latin America should not be dissipated by ridiculous loss of face. Our Western Hemisphere policy of benign leadership must be maintained . . . . I shall want a full explanation of this directive about our flag as soon as possible."

Another prominent member of Ike's party arose in protest. Denouncing the White House concession, Senator John Marshall Butler (R.-Md.) predicted that this can only lead to "further demands," and added, "I am concerned about the failure of our diplomatic experts to diagnose accurately Panamanian emotions."

To these voices were added those of two Democrats—Representatives Daniel Flood (D.-Pa.) and Armistead Seldon (D.-Ala.), both assailing the flag action of the White House.

Capitol Camera: Vice President Nixon cheered by results of the latest impartial California Field Poll. It shows that Nixon, trailing by twelve percentage points only two months ago, now leads Kennedy by a comfortable five points in the state. The figures: Nixon 49; Kennedy 44; Uncertain 7.

• *GOP members of the House committee investigating the multi-billion dollar interstate highway program charged that Democratic chairman Blatnik of Minnesota has called off an investigation into road scandals involving the Democratic administration in Massachusetts. Republican Fred Schwengel of Iowa terms the Massachusetts case "a real meaty scandal involving alleged millions of dollars of right-of-way irregularities."*

• Reports that the GOP is keeping Barry Goldwater south of the Mason-Dixon line are inaccurate. In the past week, Goldwater made major addresses for Nixon in Phoenix, Los Angeles, Chicago and Milwaukee.

• *Oregon's Senator Wayne Morse, while acting as a delegate to the United Nations, has offered to campaign for Democratic candidates in the New York area. So far he has no takers, but this is what Morse said about the Democratic party in* 1951: *"It is bankrupt for leadership and the [Truman] Administration is honeycombed with corruption and malfeasance in office."*

• The *ADA World*, official organ of the socialistic Americans for Democratic Action, reported last week that Jack Kennedy had a "perfect voting record" in the Senate this year—his third straight 100% "perfect" year.

• *John U. Barr, Chairman of the Louisiana States Rights Party in* 1948, *has just issued a statistical leaflet showing that in the South between* 1940 *and* 1956 *the Democratic vote increased only* 13%, *while the Republican vote rose a whopping* 326%. *This picture, says Barr, "evidences that Southern Democratic voters have been gradually and increasingly expressing their disapproval of the policies and actions of the National (so-called) Democratic Party."*

• Leak from the White House: There's a reason for Nixon and Lodge making publicly quite a point of their deference to Ike, as shaper of the foreign policy. Word of Ike's sensitivity about this reached the twain some time ago. This was the real reason for their hasty trip to Newport—to assure the President personally of their recognition that he runs foreign affairs.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50; 3 months $3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Business Manager: W. B. HICKS, JR.
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT GEORGE O. FOWLER
NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER ALLAN H. RYSKIND
Editorial Assistant: BARBARA STAMBAUGH *Contributing Editor*: FRANK CHODOROV

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS
--- COMMENTARY

Kennedy: "What the American labor movement wants for America is what I want, and what the American labor movement opposes, I oppose."

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Vol. XVII, No. 39 — Section III

September 29, 1960

Unions Enjoy Special Kind of Law

Labor's Monopoly Power Mushrooms Unrestrained

By Victor Riesel

The other day I chatted about unions and many things and the Pennsylvania Railroad strike with the spokesman for 20,000 business firms. He is Charles Sligh, executive vice president and operating staff chief of the National Association of Manufacturers. "This country," he said quite strongly, "cannot tolerate having two kinds of justice—one for the unions and one for everyone else."

Mr. Sligh then recalled that this summer I had interviewed Arthur Goldberg, labor's most brilliant attorney. The lawyer, who I believe some day will sit on the Supreme Court, had said that some of those who criticize labor "have always opposed the existence of effective trade unions and . . . have seized upon the element of bigness as merely the latest in a series of propaganda weapons."

Since "equal time" is in the air, I thought of "equal space" for Mr. Sligh if he cared to put his point of view on the line. He did. It's a strong point of view. Here it is:

"It should be obvious to all," said Mr. Sligh, "that in our society certain functions can be performed best by large organizations, large labor unions, large corporations, large research organizations, large educational institutions.

"Most of the critics of labor unions or of corporations do not object to 'bigness' as such. Their concern is whether this leads to a position of monopoly power.

"Size alone, as Arthur Goldberg states, is not the sole standard of good or evil. The anti-trust laws recognize this and, as Mr. Goldberg points out, these laws have not prevented the growth of America's productive corporations.

"The evil that the anti-trust laws seek to prevent in business is not 'bigness' but monopoly. This is immediately evident when one examines the anti-trust actions taken by the government. Anti-trust laws are enforced, not only in actions against giants of industry, but also against tiny companies which have either achieved monopoly or which have engaged in business practices which tend toward the elimination of competition.

"The thinking critic of today's union movement is alarmed by the monopoly power of some unions rather than by the size of the unions. For more than 50 years, the laws of the US have been strengthened constantly to protect the public against the possibility of development of monopoly power in business. Under today's laws there is no legal protection against the monopoly power of labor unions unless the unions exert this power in collusion with employers.

(Continued on page 459)

Al Smith's Defeat in 1928

The 1928 Presidential election in which Herbert Hoover beat Catholic Al Smith is becoming one of the subjects of discussion in the current election. The statement is often made that Al Smith lost BECAUSE of bigotry. It is impossible to know what was in the mind of each voter, but perhaps the election statistics might furnish some clues.

To put the 1928 election in perspective, it must be related to the 1920 and 1924 elections.

In all three elections, the Republican party won the Presidency by landslide proportions.

Here are some questions to ask those who speak in such authoritative tones about the 1928 election:

Question No. 1: Republican pluralities in the three elections held during the booming 1920's were as follows:

7,339,430 6,375,747 7,004,847

Can you allocate the proper plurality to the proper Presidential race?

Harding versus Cox 1920.....
Coolidge versus Davis 1924.....
Hoover versus Smith 1928.....

The Democratic proportions of the two-party vote in those three elections were:

41.2% 36.2% 34.8%

Can you allocate the proper percentage to the proper election?

In one of those three GOP landslides, the Republican Presidential nominee polled 5,239,990 more than any previous GOP nominee had ever polled. But his Democratic opponent made an even better showing in relation to previous elections. He polled 5,869,090 more votes than had been cast for any previous Democratic nominee. Of which election was this true?

After you have tried answering these questions, turn to the BOX on PAGE 459 for the correct answers.

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

You, Too?

From a reader: "I like HUMAN EVENTS in 16 pages and especially that it comes in four separate sections enclosed in envelopes. After I have read HUMAN EVENTS, I mail each of the four sections to someone who will appreciate its valuable information."

Exchange Policy Is Sucker Game

From the New York Daily News

Internal Security Subcommittee of the US Senate has released an interesting report on the much-ballyhooed cultural exchanges between this country and Soviet Russia and what the United States gets out of them.

In the 11 months ended January 19, 1960, Russia sent 1,897 civilians here under the cultural exchange agreement. These persons looked us over from various angles, then went home and reported in books, newspapers and magazines on what they claimed to have seen.

Lies About the US

The Internal Security Subcommittee chairman Senator James O. Eastland (D.-Miss.) has gone through a lot of these reports. The subcommittee finds that virtually all of them were violently and lyingly unfavorable to the United States.

Here is a sample lie, by one Vladimir Nikolaev:

Every [American] policeman is acquainted with the principles of medicine. Every policeman can, for example, render assistance at childbirth. Poor people often take advantage of this fact. Not everyone by any means can pay a doctor for assistance at childbirth, and to bring forth a child on the street, assisted by a policeman, is considered an accident and therefore is free of charge.

Ill-Conceived Theory

This is the kind of stuff that is being circulated through Russia, by Communist stooges and mouthpieces who have come over here on the theory—believed in by many Americans from the President on down—that US-Russian exchanges of students, entertainers, labor leaders, farm experts, and so on, will build up mutual understanding and loosen tensions between the two nations.

The Kremlin is using the cultural exchange programs to spread lies about the United States throughout the Red Slave Empire—lies calculated to convince the slaves that Communism is the ideal system and the Capitalist United States a hell on earth.

Really, isn't it about time for a reappraisal of the cultural exchange notion? In this, as in all other attempts to date to deal honestly and honorably with the Russian Reds, the United States Government is being played for a sucker.

Aid To Ineffective Farms Causes Agriculture Mess

From the Cleveland Plain Dealer

The farm problem is complex; any discussion of it is apt to sound like oversimplification. Yet certain things are true:

Two million commercial farms (those whose annual gross sales are $2,500 or more) produce more than 90% of the farm products which move to market. These are the farmers with know-how, credit, adequate machinery, sufficient land, etc., against whom the little farmer must compete.

Large Farms Get Large Share

Experts point out that it is the small farmer who causes supports on certain commodities to remain high, yet the larger operator, through no particular greed of his own, gets the larger share. Many of the big and more efficient producers could operate at a profit on supports much lower than they are today. In other words, because of the politics involved, the small farmer is to a very large degree responsible for the high parity payments which cost the taxpayers billions of dollars.

What can be done about it if it is true, as many believe, that the ragged-edged farmers would be better off if they got out of farming? They would have to get jobs elsewhere. How would such jobs be provided? By developing a healthy industrial climate in which business would expand—and one thing which would help in this direction would be to give the nation more financial stability by cutting out the wasted billions now poured into the agricultural mess.

There would appear to be no overnight cure; if there is progress it must be gradual, with a gradual but continuous lowering of price supports, until there would be no point in overproducing because Uncle Sam would pay more than the market place. Substandard farmers who have managed to hang on this long probably could last until the business climate improved and jobs opened up. If not, individual cases could be considered on their merits by local governments or helping-hand organizations.

Lowering Supports Is Effective

Again and again, lowering of price supports has proved effective, as in the case of the soybean, in which the price support has dropped from $2.56 a bushel in 1953 to $1.85 today. The market price is some 25 cents above this. So what has happened? This year's crop of 528 million bushels is less than the expected demand—so prices are firm. There is no surplus, even though soybeans are not subject to acreage controls.

A constant lowering of price supports, and providing other jobs for ineffective farmers—these appear to be most important factors in solving the farm problem.

Poland Undermines US Capitalism With Help From American Dollars

From the Indianapolis Star

Fourteen years ago, the Communist government of Poland seized several hundred million dollars worth of American property (stocks, land, personal effects and individual property). A few weeks ago, after years of fruitless negotiations, the United States accepted Poland's offer to pay $40,000,000 in settlement, and at the same time—to show our gratitude for Poland's kindness—agreed to sell that Red captive land $130,000,000 worth of surplus farm products, payable over a 20-year period.

We Won't Let Communism Die

Uncle Sam has been extremely generous toward Poland, a nation whose rulers are determined to bury capitalism. When in 1956 her people revolted, demanding freedom and food (her vaunted collectivized farm program left Poland near starvation that year), our President offered the Communist government free food, an offer which helped bail the Red government out of its predicament. Since that year, instead of allowing communism to die because of an inability to feed its subjects, the United States has entrenched Red rule by selling Poland $426,300,000 worth of food.

In addition, the United States has extended 61 million dollars in credits to the Polish Communist government, through the Export-Import Bank, for purchases of industrial equipment and medical supplies—repayable on easy terms over long periods of time.

Government Propaganda Softens Public

It is almost unbelievable that a handful of influential American politicians, egged on by the entrenched internationalists outside the government, would tax American citizens in order to support a hostile regime intent on enslaving mankind. None of the weak excuses offered for this action is plausible, and, in another time would not be tolerated for one minute. But the American public has been so softened by massive government propaganda and public relations techniques that it is unable or unwilling to protest.

In the meantime, as our presidential hopefuls tell us of the need for "bold, new policies" to combat the Communist threat, and warn us that we must prepare additional sacrifices and hardships, the Communist governments continue to hurl their defiance at Uncle Sam while he meekly responds by sending them more and more aid.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Do It Yourself

Chicago Sun-times (Field) goes along with the idea that the US shouldn't have government doing things for its people on a grand scale. America is a "do-it-yourself" country, it says. —N. Y. Post.

Kennedy Shuns 'Bama

Gene Wortsman, Washington correspondent of the Birmingham *Post-Herald*, reports "the odds 50-50 that John Kennedy won't make a campaign speech in Alabama." Noting which, Alabama's Democratic Campaign Chairman Adams here perpetrates one of the most diaphanous cover-ups in the history of hiding. "We're realistic about it," he is quoted, "This is a big nation and they can't go everywhere."

—John Temple Graves.

Answers to Questions on First Page

The Republican plurality against Al Smith was the SMALLEST of the three landslide pluralities.

Al Smith got a HIGHER percentage (41.2) of the two-party vote than did either Cox or Davis.

In the question about the nominee who increased his party's vote MOST over its previous PEAK, the answer is that Al Smith raised his party's vote more—by 5,869,090, while Hoover raised his party's by 5,239,990.

	Republican	Democratic	GOP Plurality	Democratic Percentage of the 2-party vote
1920	16,152,200	9,147,353	7,004,847	36.2
1924	15,725,016	8,385,586	7,339,430	34.8
1928	21,392,190	15,016,443	6,375,747	41.2

In 1924, Robert M. LaFollette defected from the GOP to run as a third-party nominee. He got 4,822,856 votes.

In 1928, in the Solid South, bigots preached from the pulpits against Al Smith's religion, but how many votes did he lose for that reason? He lost Tennessee but that state had gone for Harding in 1920. He lost North Carolina, Virginia, Texas and Florida, but did he lose them on account of religion or because he was "wet" in a year when the South was overwhelmingly and passionately "dry?" Also the South was traditionally anti-Tammany; Smith boasted of his membership with that political organization.

In all the talk about antagonism to Smith in the South, it seems to be forgotten that Smith's majorities were overwhelming in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina and Georgia. In a sixth state, Alabama, he won "handily."

Finally, it should be remembered that the election of 1928 was held in a boom year. Until the 1929 crash, prosperity and Republicanism were supposed to be synonymous.

Labor's Unrestrained Monopoly Power...

(Continued from page 457)

"This double standard of law, which makes identical actions illegal if performed by one organization and legal if performed by another, obviously cannot be right. The public deserves protection from monopolies no matter from what quarter they threaten.

"It is evident that a union, to be effective, must not be substantially weaker than the employer with which it must deal. But there are many unions today which are overwhelmingly stronger than the employers with which they must deal.

One Union Grips Many Companies

"In the mass production industries which Mr. Goldberg mentions, many companies compete with each other, while in most such industries one union deals with all employers and holds bargaining strength far greater than any individual company with which it deals.

"For instance, five companies make passenger automobiles in quantity, but one union dictates the labor conditions in all of them. In the steel industry, which Mr. Goldberg cites, there are many producing companies, but only one major union.

"Such situations as these have lead to industry-wide bargaining and inevitably to industry-wide strikes which endanger the welfare of the nation at large and of every citizen in it. A strike in steel, as we have recently seen demonstrated, can create what amounts to a recession.

"The power of monopoly unions has the same effect as a monopoly in the production of a commodity. It forces up the price that the consumer must pay, therefore curtailing the market for the product and reducing employment opportunities in the affected industry.

Small Unions Can Be Monopolistic

"Small unions, as well as large, are found in monopoly positions. In New York, we have seen steamfitters, who already were drawing wages exceeding the pay of college professors and many professional men in industry, striking in rejection of an increase of around 70 cents an hour. They are able, through monopoly action, to prevent completion of nearly every building under construction in the city.

"Such monopolies, even when they involve relatively few members, have a broad effect upon the public.

"There is a direct connection between the five-figure compensation of building workers and the fact that new low and middle income housing has become virtually impossible to produce in the city without subsidies from the taxpayer's pocket.

They Are Not Feeble Infants

"The public has seen too many demonstrations of overwhelming union strength to be persuaded that they are still feeble infant organizations which require special privileges under the law in order to survive.

"Over the portals of the US Supreme Court are the words 'Equal Justice Under the Law.' This concept has not yet been applied to the privileged unions and the need to do so is increasingly evident as many unions take actions which would bring prosecution if committed by anyone else in our society. Americans cannot tolerate having two kinds of justice—one for unions and one for everyone else."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Similarity of the 'New Frontiers'

By J. L. and D. D. Wick

The person who put the phrase "The New Frontier" into Jack Kennedy's subconscious chose better than he knew.

"The New Frontier" promises something for nothing to every voting group whose support Kennedy needs to become President. In Las Vegas, there's a hotel by that name which the local inhabitants say "isn't doing very well." The appeal of the hotel—like Jack Kennedy's—is to people who want a hundred dollars of somebody else's money in exchange for a dollar of their own.

Seek Fantasy World

To Las Vegas every week come thousands of such people seeking for a few hours to live in a fantasy world.

With what result?

The wisecracks passed on to visitors by the local taxi drivers tell the tale!

The stewardesses in the arriving planes tell the deplaning passengers to "fasten your money-belts."

One man arrived in a $7000 Cadillac. He left in a $70,000 bus.

One man left with $100,000. He came with $500,000.

The city's leading industry: the manufacture of INSTANT POVERTY.

Congressional Race

NEVADA POLITICS: Neither the two Senators from Nevada nor the Governor —all Democrats—come up for reelection this year. Political interests center in the Congressional race; Nevada has only one Congressman.

The 5-term incumbent Democrat, Walter Baring, "Mr. Nothing," has a conservative voting record, according to ACA-Index, of 22 per cent.

Facing Baring in November will be former U. S. Senator George W. Malone, who was opposed for the Republican nomination by a young multimillionaire named Bill Tyson, nephew of Perle Mesta.

Tyson Eyes Treasury

Ambitious young Tyson ran large newspaper ads telling Nevada voters they should send to Congress a man who will develop what he calls "a sensible relationship with the Washington bureaucrats." He says that only with the good will of government agencies in Washington can a Congressman get projects and benefits for his constituents. Maybe Tyson's Aunt Perle should take him in hand and tell him confidential-like how you get the good will of Washington bureaucrats. The method is very, very simple: Let the bureaucrats know you will represent THEM in Congress, NOT the taxpayers! ! Tell them you will get more money and more power

for their bureaus. If you do that for them, they will, to the limit of their abilities, empty the US Treasury for you. But if Perle were to tell him those elementary facts, she ought also to tell him something more; namely that such a platform is more appropriate for a Democratic candidate than for a Republican candidate. By their very nature, Democratic voters hold to the teenage belief that money obtained doesn't have to be repaid. They think of the US Treasury as a place they want money from; the more the better. Republican voters tend to think of the US Treasury as a place they send money to; the less the better.

Big Spenders Feel at Home

It is quite true that there are some of both kinds of people in each party. Nevertheless, Big Spenders feel more at home in the Democratic party and Economizers feel more at home in the Republican party.

Next to the Congressional race, the absorbing topic of conversation in Nevada is the Presidential race. Betting odds at the Las Vegas office of the Santa Anita Turf Club have been about 8 to 5 on Nixon. The total sums wagered determined the odds. 1948: 10 to 1 on Dewey. The political editors of both Las Vegas newspapers told us Nixon may carry the state despite its 2 to 1 Democratic registration. Pat Nixon was born in a tent in Ely, Nevada.

The factor helping Nixon in several western states is the prosperity that comes with phenomenal growth and development. The incoming residents, furthermore, tend to be "natural Republicans," say the local political leaders. For the most part, they are the confident, aggressive sort; the older ones often bring a nest egg they want to protect against inflation.

Democrats Work Hard

The factor helping Kennedy in Nevada is the strong state political organization; the top state offices are all Democratic and the state organization is united and working hard.

Kennedy has been strongly aided in Nevada by the union-organized registration drive which follows the national AFL-CIO pattern. Union-paid canvassers call on every home asking about the voting preference. These reports are turned over to union-paid follow-up teams which bring the Kennedy voters to the registration booths—skipping all Nixon homes. On election day, union-paid teams will get to the polls 100 per cent of the Kennedy vote.

This plan, organized two years ago down to the last comma for every precinct in the United States, is the Reuther-Carey-Meany Secret Weapon with which they expect to put Kennedy in the White House.

COMMENTARY reprints available: single copy 20c; 10 for $1; 25 for $2; 100 for $5; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

20 Questions About Jack Kennedy

Would Kennedy, if elected, be the youngest person ever elected President?

Answer: YES. Teddy Roosevelt was not elected to the PRESIDENCY until 1904, when he was 46. In 1900, Teddy was elected VICE President; upon President McKinley's death in 1901, he succeeded to the Presidency 43 days BEFORE his 43rd birthday. Kennedy's inauguration—if he wins—would take place eight months AFTER his 43rd birthday.

How good was Kennedy's war record?

Answer: Jack Kennedy was a P-T Boat commander in the Pacific during World War II. His heroic exploits make him an authentic war hero.

Did Kennedy marry a poor girl or a rich girl?

Answer: Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy did not marry Jack for his money. She comes from a wealthy stock brokerage family and will herself be a millionaire when she inherits her share of the family fortune.

Was Kennedy's Pulitzer-prize winning book, "Profiles in Courage," ghostwritten for him?

Answer: Drew Pearson once implied that Kennedy did not himself write "Profiles in Courage," but insiders now credit him with the writing. Some of the research was done by aides.

Do labor leaders "trust" or "fear" Kennedy?

Answer: They do not trust him. They fear he might try to be a "strong man" President. They do not worry about anti-labor legislation—knowing that Kennedy will have to rely upon the labor forces for re-election in 1964. But they think Kennedy might neglect to "consult" them about patronage and policy matters. Labor leaders want to be the most influential part of the White House inner circle.

Reuther and Meany, however, did not oppose Kennedy despite their personal preference for Humphrey at L.A. They feel sure Kennedy can be elected; they felt Humphrey could not be. Kennedy's voting record, like Humphrey's, is 100 per cent pro-labor and pro-ADA.

Has Kennedy ever used his religion to advance his interests?

Answer: YES. In 1956, seeking the No. 2 spot, he and his aides made up charts showing the size of the Catholic vote in the pivotal states, insisting that the way to win that swing bloc was to nominate him—because he was a Catholic.

This year, aiming for the Presidency, Kennedy has not been above using what his rivals angrily call "religious blackmail." He bluntly reminded party leaders prior to the Democratic convention that Roman Catholics composed 50 per cent or more of the Democratic vote in a dozen states. He added that under those circumstances, having made a better showing in the primaries than his rivals, refusal to nominate him would cause a bitter Catholic revolt against the Democratic party.

How well liked is Kennedy by those who know him best—his fellow Senators?

Answer: Only Kefauver rates lower in the Senate's popularity poll.* Kennedy has no sense of fair play whatever, say his fellow-Senators. One of the many stories they tell is about Kennedy's report to the waiting press when the Senate-House conference on the labor-reform bill was breaking up in disagreement. Jack told the press of offering concessions he had never mentioned in committee. He implied the conservatives were unreasonable—because they had rejected concessions they had never heard of. This false implication was considered unforgivable—by Democrats as well as Republicans. One of the members of the Committee put it this way: "Jack is a typically spoiled rich man's son. He thinks everybody on earth is here solely to do for him. But that curly-headed little kid is no weakling. Throughout his entire career, he has proven that he will run roughshod over anyone who gets in his way."

*In 1952, running for the Presidency, Kefauver had the active eager support of only one Senator, Paul Douglas of Illinois, who disliked his fellow-Illinoisan, Adlai Stevenson. Kefauver shuns all the drudgery of closed-door Committee work, but he jumps out in front whenever there is a chance to get into the headlines.

Why has Jack been described as "utterly ruthless" by fellow-Democrats in Massachusetts who refused to accept his leadership?

Answer: Jack Kennedy's reputation in Massachusetts is one of utter ruthlessness. At 39 years of age, when he saw that it would be to his advantage, he rudely shoved aside the revered dean of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation, Democratic leader John McCormack, in his fight for control of the state organization. Said a Boston newsman who had watched him closely for a dozen years: "Jack is hard as nails; he is mean and tough. Nobody—short of the voters—is going to stop him from getting what he wants."

Democratic Governors Brown of California, DiSalle of Ohio and Tawes of Maryland—expecting in traditional fashion to be favorite sons—each received an ultimatum to knuckle under to Kennedy or face a no-holds barred fight for the state delegation. They all surrendered but they will joyfully tar and feather their Conqueror if he fails to win the Presidency.

If Kennedy is elected, who will be the Secretary of State?

Answer: Stevenson would become Secretary of State if he had removed himself from the Presidential race before Kennedy got a majority at the convention. Now the spot is more likely to go to Chester Bowles. Because Adlai's chances are no longer as good, some of his fans have chilled toward Kennedy. Their defection may cost the Democratic nominee California and/or New York.

In Wisconsin, how did Kennedy compete with Humphrey in making promises to those among the farmers who believe the government owes them a living?

Answer: Humphrey pointed out that during Kennedy's earlier years in Congress, he voted against high farm supports. Kennedy explained that he was voting for the interests of Massachusetts farmers who buy feed from the West and want lower, not higher feed prices.

But Kennedy also showed that since 1956 (when he got Presidential ambitions), he has voted exactly the same way as Humphrey—for everything wanted by the farmers who want government subsidies. The two Senators have shown no interest whatever in the welfare of taxpayers or consumers, neither of which are organized.

Kennedy was in the hospital during the McCarthy censure trial. While there, he wrote "Profiles in Courage." When and under what circumstances did Kennedy make known his position on McCarthy? How does Mrs. Roosevelt describe Kennedy's political courage?

Answer: Mrs. Roosevelt has described the Senator as "All Profile and No Courage" because for four years he

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evaded all questions about how he would have voted on the Censure Resolution. Boston—55 per cent Irish—was a McCarthy stronghold. The Irish vote was essential to Kennedy's re-election in 1958. Once that election was past, Kennedy—four years late—announced that he would have voted against McCarthy.

Was there anything shady or illegal about the way the Senator's father, Joseph P. Kennedy, made his 400 million-dollar fortune?

Answer: No! The fortune was made in real estate, motion pictures, stock speculations—and whiskey. Only about the latter has there been any question raised. As told in the pro-Kennedy book "The Remarkable Kennedys" by Joe McCarthy, Joseph P. Kennedy, knowing that prohibition would be repealed, "made a trip to Europe with Jimmy and Betsy Cushing Roosevelt and came back with a deal that made Somerset (a Kennedy-owned corporation) the US agents for Haig and Haig, King William and John Dewar Scotch whiskeys and for Gordon's Gin. Five years later, when Kennedy was Ambassador to the Court of St. James, the *Saturday Evening Post* published a caustic article about Jimmy Roosevelt, written by the late Alva Johnston, which contended that the President's son had introduced Kennedy, in London in 1933, to the British distillers who controlled the Scotch whiskeys. Because his government permits enabled him to import big quantities of Scotch and gin for 'medicinal purposes' before the prohibition law was repealed, Kennedy was able to have his Somerset warehouse filled to the brim with Haig and Haig and Dewar's when the United States went wet and opened its bars.

"When Johnston's *Saturday Evening Post* article was published, Kennedy heatedly denied that it was Jimmy Roosevelt who put him into the liquor business. He said to reporters, 'Kennedy was doing all right by himself before he ever met Jimmy Roosevelt.' Last year a friend of Joe was speculating about the reasons for Eleanor Roosevelt's outspoken opposition to Jack Kennedy and her remarks in her column about Joe sending large sums of money to put his son in the White House. 'I suspect it may go back to that time when Jimmy Roosevelt helped Joe with that Scotch whiskey deal,' Kennedy's friend said. 'Maybe Jimmy thought he and Joe were going to be partners. If so, he soon found out that when Joe Kennedy is starting a business he doesn't have partners.' "

Does Kennedy support the bill in Congress weakening the ban on secondary boycotts to allow building trades to picket construction projects buying non-union products (such as Kohler)?

Answer: He certainly does. HE INTRODUCED THE BILL.

Did Kennedy support the Forand bill which would have made a $2.4 billion beginning (ultimate cost, $8 billion) toward providing socialized medicine for the aged? Medical authorities argue that free medical attention to the aged would, as in England, fill up doctors' offices with hypochondriacs, reducing attention to the seriously ill—of all ages.

Answer: Kennedy certainly did support the Forand bill. HE INTRODUCED THE SENATE COUNTERPART.

Does Kennedy oppose the "Right to Loaf" bill that would allow a person, after earning as little as $1,730 in wages, to "become unemployed" and then collect as much as $2,301 in unemployment benefits over a 39-week period?

Answer: Does he oppose it? HE INTRODUCED THE BILL.

Does Kennedy support the bill providing several hundred million dollars in Federal money to induce industries in prosperous areas to build their new factories in "depressed" areas?

Answer: Kennedy strongly supports this bill.

Is Kennedy a moderate? How does he come out on the rating sheets of the ultra-Liberal ADA (Americans for Democratic Action)?

Answer: Kennedy is no moderate—despite the fact that he talks that way when among conservatives. His voting record is almost identical with Hubert Humphrey's. Each of the two men agreed upon this fact in their Wisconsin contest.

Democratic party intellectuals such as Schlesinger, Lippmann and Galbraith say that too much of the national income is now going to "the masses." They want more of the national income siphoned through higher taxes to the Federal government—which they say will spend it "more wisely." Will such thinking govern Kennedy in the White House?

Answer: The Eggheads who subscribe to these doctrines idolize Stevenson; they admire Humphrey. They wish that Kennedy had their vision of a "managed America." However, though Kennedy does not use their lyrical language in talking about the Utopia that will arrive if they can run the country, they are not worried. They know that a "managed America" is inevitable if all the measures Kennedy has promised to support become law. These programs would give the Federal government the full responsibility for taking care of everybody from cradle to grave and they would have the Federal government pay more and more of the costs of local improvements—reducing communities and states to mere agencies of the central government. The overwhelming cost of all these programs would require the Federal government to reduce the ability of the masses to buy what the eggheads contemptuously call "frills and gadgets."

How did Kennedy earn the dislike of Eleanor Roosevelt and Harry Truman?

Answer: In 1949, as a member of the House of Representatives, having probably no serious White House aspirations, Kennedy made a speech in Salem, Massachusetts, saying that a "sick" Roosevelt at Yalta followed by Truman "frittered away what had been won in the Far East" (namely, China). In another address, January 25, 1949, made just before complete collapse of Nationalist Chinese resistance, he blamed Acheson for having taken bad advice from "the Lattimores and the Fairbanks."

How likely is Kennedy to be our next President? If he is to be defeated, how can it be done?

Answer: Labor party candidates in advanced industrial countries have failed of election everywhere in recent years. The United States will be an exception only if the conservative forces fail to get out the votes of the conservative majority in this country.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS

408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "20 QUESTIONS ABOUT JACK KENNEDY" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for air-mail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription

☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone ____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Countess Waldeck, a Ph.D. from Heidelberg University and an American citizen, is a political writer and novelist. In Weimer Republic days, as Frau Ullstein (of the famous magazine publishing family), she was renowned as a great wit and beauty. (Some refer to her as "the Clare Luce of that era.") Among her books, the best known are "Europe Between the Acts," "Athene Palace" and "Lustre in the Sky."

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Vol. XVII, No. 39, Section II **HUMAN EVENTS** September 29, 1960

Homosexual International

By R. G. WALDECK

ON MARCH 25, 1952, Mr. Carlisle H. Humelsine, Deputy Undersecretary of State, told* the House Appropriations Committee that the State Department had ousted 119 homosexuals during the previous year.** Thus, almost casually, there was brought to public attention a most important and dangerous state of affairs, namely the invasion of American political life by "the men of Sodom" (Genesis 13:13).

Popular reaction to this sensational piece of news ranged all the way from righteous indignation on religious grounds to a pseudo-liberal attitude of "tolerance." However, few people bothered to inquire deeply into the facts of the matter. Even those who cautioned against homosexuals on the ground that they represented a bad security risk, did so mainly because their social vulnerability exposed them to all sorts of blackmail.

Valid as this aspect of the problem is, it is a comparatively minor one. In reality the main reason why, at this juncture of history, the elimination of the homosexuals from all Government agencies and especially from the State Department is of vital urgency is that by the very nature of their vice they belong to a sinister, mysterious and efficient International.

Welded together by the identity of their forbidden desires, of their strange, sad needs, habits, dangers, not to mention their outrageously fatuous vocabulary, members of this International constitute a world-wide conspiracy against society. This conspiracy has spread all over the globe; has penetrated all classes; operates in armies and in prisons; has infiltrated into the press, the movies and the cabinets; and it all but dominates the arts, literature, theater, music and TV.

And here is why homosexual officials are a peril to us in the present struggle between West and East: members of one conspiracy are prone to join another conspiracy. This is one reason why so many homosexuals from being enemies of society in general, become enemies of capitalism in particular. Without being necessarily Marxist they serve the ends of the Communist International in the name of their rebellion against the prejudices, standards, ideals of the "bourgeois" world. Another reason for the homosexual-Communist alliance is the instability and passion for intrigue for intrigue's sake, which is inherent in the homosexual personality. A third reason is the social promiscuity within the homosexual minority and the fusion it effects between upperclass and proletarian corruption.

Political Corrosion

SODOM has always been in politics. Long before there was a Homosexual International, homosexual intrigue—sometimes on an international scale—enlivened the political and diplomatic annals. I mention only Julius Caesar's affair with King Nicomedes of Bithynia which excited his contemporaries much more than the one with Cleopatra. To paraphrase a remark of Marcel Proust—love of men led Caesar unto virility and virility unto glory, as it did some other extraordinary personalities, such as Richard Coeur de Lion and Frederick the Great of Prussia. There was the reign of the "mignons" which became the undoing of Henri III, last of the Valois Kings, and the homosexual camarilla around "Monsieur," Louis XIV's brother, which occasionally said it with murder. There is also the diplomatic agent of Louis XV, the ambiguous Chevalier d'Eon who, turning up alternately in men's and women's clothes, functioned for a while in St. Petersburg as a female reader of Elizabeth of Russia only to present himself later as an adoring *ephebe* of Frederick the Great in Potsdam.

But it was the great homosexual scandal of the early twentieth century—the Eulenburg case—which awakened public opinion to the menace of homosexuality in politics. This famous German case was first exposed in 1906 in a series of startling articles by Maximilian Harden in *Die Zukunft*. These articles charged that Prince "Phili" Eulenburg, the Kaiser's favorite, and his clique of homosexual friends, formed a "State within the State, a Government against the Government" on the very steps of the throne. "There exist," Harden claimed, "two policies, the official policy and the secret policy of Eulenburg." The latter's policy was inspired, he insisted, by the homosexual French

*Washington *Evening Star*, March 25, 1952.

**On February 26, 1951, Mr. Humelsine told the House Committee that the State Department had purged itself of 54 homosexuals in the preceding twelve months; and a year previous, the State Department told a Senate Committee that between 1947 and 1950, the Department had got rid of 91 homosexuals. See Hearings before Senate subcommittee for Appropriations, 81st Congress, 2nd Session, Part I, Pages 602-3. Hearings before the subcommittee for Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82nd Congress, 1st Session, Pages 390-1.

Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Charge d'Affairs in Berlin and was designed to weaken the German position.

Harden could write like an avenging angel when he was angry, and he was very angry. An admirer of the late Prince Bismarck, he was horrified by the rapid deterioration of the powerful Reich forged by the "Iron Chancellor," and believed he found the key to this deterioration: German public life was riddled with homosexuality. In fact, the Eulenburg scandal was preceeded and paralleled by other homosexual scandals featuring high aristocrats, generals, industrialists, many of whom belonged to the Kaiser's intimate circle. Hence: Sodom delenda est! The homosexuals had to be eliminated from influential positions. No state—Harden was convinced—was strong enough to withstand their corroding influence.

I was a young child in Germany when after months of such attacks Prince Eulenburg found himself finally compelled to sue Harden for libel; I can still remember the shock it was to public opinion when Harden won. The verdict came after a long drawn-out litigation, and right up to the end the German bourgeoise was convinced that Harden was a liar. They could not believe that the scabrous stories he told about the mighty were true. Harden's final triumph spelled not only Eulenburg's but also the Kaiser's guilt. Not that Wilhelm was ever suspected of belonging to Sodom himself. However, he had shown a deplorable affinity for homosexuals and this was enough to make of the Eulenburg case the "necklace affair" of the German Empire—a morbid manifestation of a state of general depravity that later erupted into the tragedy of World War I.

The Tie That Binds

THERE ARE various theories concerning the origin of homosexuality. Some attribute it to a glandular predisposition; others to a hereditary one. According to modern psychology the homosexual is a victim of arrested emotional development which makes it impossible for him to sublimate a childhood experience of identification with and jealousy of the mother. All agree that, as the feminine element marks, more or less subtly, his gestures, his contours, his voice, a complicated mass of obscure hates, frustrations, inferiority feelings and guilt feelings mark his humiliated soul.

In other words, the homosexual would be an unhappy and unstable human being, even if he were not forced to "live in falsehood and perjury" (Marcel Proust). Still, the opprobrium and the dangers weighing on him add greatly to his instability. More or less consciously he hates a society which makes him feel "different" and which, judging his deepest desires as shameful and punishable, forces him to conceal, deny, camouflage them.

This many grounded vulnerability in itself, Harden understood, made the homosexual a bad security risk. And he also understood this aggravating factor—namely that the mysterious laws which rule this condemned portion of humanity are more binding on its members than any national, spiritual, social loyalties. With downright McCarthyish pertinacity, Harden insisted that there was such a thing as an international homosexual conspiracy gnawing away at the very sinews of the state. At the time of his writing, this was an exaggeration, but somehow the future dwelt in him and his exaggeration previewed a not-too-distant reality.

Actually, the Homosexual International began to gnaw at the sinews of the state in the 1930's. Until then it just nibbled. I have before me notes I took years ago about that nibbling stage. Still very new to politics, I was amazed to discover that the "Cherchez l'homme" pointed to a much more powerful factor in international affairs than the "Cherchez la femme."

WITH FASCINATION I watched the little Sodoms functioning within the Embassies and foreign offices. Somehow homosexuals always seemed to come by the dozen, not because they were cheaper that way but rather because a homosexual ambassador or charge d'affaires or Undersecretary of State liked to staff his "team" with his own people. Another reason was that the homosexuals really do look after their own. "Damn it, in order to make a career one should have been abnormal." That's how Baron Holstein, Gray Eminence of the Wilhelmstrasse, commented on Harden's disclosures of this fine-meshed network of direct and indirect influences with the help of which the homosexual cliques pushed their members into important positions.

The scope of this article does not permit naming names and places. This is regrettable on historical grounds. For, the "Cherchez l'homme" is the key to many happenings in international politics which the newspapers don't explain.

Why had a certain capitalist country such an amazing influence on the politics of a certain revolutionary country? Because the aristocratic ambassador of the capitalist country was a homosexual and so was the foreign minister of the revolutionary country, and the perfect understanding between them cut across ideologies. Why did a certain bilateral trade conference, which seemed hopelessly bogged down, suddenly come to life again? Because the homosexual head of one mission, in order to please the homosexual aide of another mission, decided to sacrifice some vested interests at home for the sake of better understanding abroad. There were many instances of this kind; they didn't then add up to a menace. But in politics it is always smart to fear a power not because it *is* dangerous but because it could *become* dangerous.

That the Homosexual International could become dangerous should have been evident to anyone who had an opportunity to observe the mysterious manner in which homosexuals recognize each other —by a glance, a gesture, an indefinable pitch of voice—and the astonishing understanding which this recognition creates between men who seem to be socially or politically at opposite poles. True, other Internationals are better organized and more articulate. But what is the unifying force of race, of faith, of ideology as compared to the unifying force of a vice which intimately links the press tycoon to the beggar, the jailbird to the Ambassador, the General to the pullman porter?

Homosexuality and Communism

THE ALLIANCE between the Homosexual International and the Communist International started at the dawn of the Pink Decade. It was then that the homosexual aristocracy—writers,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poets, painters and such—discovered Marxism. Why did this bleak doctrine charm people who up to now had posed as decadent aesthetes? No doubt, the same sentiments which motivated the Communist conversion of intellectuals in general—such as opposition to Nazism and Fascism, visions of the end of capitalism and the need of a faith—played a part in the Communist conversion of homosexual intellectuals. But particular emotions gave it an additional fervor.

First of all, a sense of guilt concerning their forbidden desires and the hope to purge themselves of it by cooperating with the Workers' Movement loomed large. Then too, the Communist assumption that the workers represented the future gave a respectable facade to that social promiscuity which is the secret element of their vice. As some women take up bridge or golf or current affairs because it gives them a common interest with the men they love, the upperclass homosexuals took up Marxism because they felt this brought them closer to their proletarian *ephebes.*

Furthermore, the promise of a classless society where everyone would be free appealed to their own need of freedom from "bourgeois" constraint. For, weren't they too an oppressed class? Weren't they too "threatened in their conditions of existence" (Communist Manifesto)? The way they figured it the Communists in fighting capitalism were revenging them for the ostracism which capitalist society held forever dangling over their heads.

True, quite a few homosexual intellectuals soon found that Marxism wasn't all it was cracked up to be. Thus the great French writer Andre Gide—whom the European homosexuals call "our Goethe"—solemnly repudiated the god that failed. Others followed his example, especially when they discovered that Russia was by no means the homosexual paradise they had imagined.

Such notable defections notwithstanding, Marxism did not lose its lure for Sodom. On the contrary. As things developed the Homosexual International has become a sort of auxiliary of the Communist International. This is the more alarming since the homosexuals are multiplying as the sand upon the seashore.

Boon to the Comintern

IS THERE such a thing as a Homosexual Five Year Plan? I have heard this question frequently discussed during my travels in Europe—and by no means in jest. Some astute observers insisted that the disturbing increase in homosexuality, not to speak of its Marxist accentuation, is the result of a Moscow-directed propaganda expressly designed to corrode the tissues of capitalist society.

I believe that they overstate their case. A man doesn't become a homosexual by propaganda just as he doesn't become clubfooted by propaganda. But it goes without saying that Moscow has long recognized the potentialities of the Homosexual International.

There are two factors which make the Homosexual International a boon to the Comintern—one is that it puts at her disposal a network which, superior to her own in scope and flexibility, is almost impenetrably obscure. And the other is that this network moves in natural harmony with Communist aims.

If the homosexuals did nothing but diffuse their particular brand of moral and physical corruption through the media of entertainment, they would merit well by Khrushchev. A case in point is their infiltration of TV, which Robert C. Ruark castigated so wittily in his column "In Lieu of Humor" in the New York *World Telegram.* Probably no Communist propaganda is intended by these comedians who, giggling and swishing and addressing each other by girls' names, invade the American home via the screen. But one can't help wondering what will become of a society whose children and youngsters are constantly exposed to the nauseating ambiguousness of their mannerism, their poses, their jokes. The moral advantages for the Communist cause of getting the American "home folks" to absorb and applaud these indecent nance-acts cannot be overrated.

Political Intrigue

IN THE POLITICAL FIELD, too, the Homosexual International works into the hands of the Comintern without any special organizing effort. This does not mean that every homosexual diplomat or official is a Communist or even a fellow-traveller. Still, this dangerous mixture of anti-social hostility and social promiscuity inherent in the vice inclines them towards Communist causes. That's why agencies in which homosexuals are numerous excel in the sort of intrigue and doubletalk which, apparently objective, somehow always coincides with the party line. One could probably trace some of our more preposterous foreign policy decisions during the last 25 years to the little Sodom inside the State Department. Then too, a study of the the OWI—veritable home from home for the Homosexual International during the war—would yield a few fascinating cues.

Natural Secret Agents

THERE IS another even more sinister aspect of homosexuality in high places. It is that homosexuals make natural secret agents and natural traitors. This conclusion is to be drawn from a theory developed by Professor Theodor Reik in his "Psychology of Sex Relations." Briefly, this theory is that the phantasy of sex metamorphosis operating in most homosexual affairs which causes him to play the role of the other sex causes him also to enjoy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any job which gives him the chance of playing a double role.

The classical example is the famous espionage case of the homosexual Colonel Alfred Redl of the Austro-Hungarian Military Intelligence who, during the decade preceding World War I, delivered Austrian military secrets to the Russians and denounced his own agents to them. He got an immense kick out of playing the role of both the traitor and of the one whose lifework it is to apprehend and punish traitors.

Traitors? On June 11, 1951, we found Member of Parliament George Wigg, in the British House of Commons debate of that day, referring to press reports of "widespread sexual perversion in the Foreign Office." This came at the time when Parliament was aroused over the mysterious affair of the two missing British diplomats who disappeared behind the Iron Curtain.

As a matter of fact, there has been in the British foreign service a long tradition of unconventional diplomats, quite a few of whom were homosexuals. In normal times this did not matter much; a homosexual diplomat would do as well by his country as a normal one, and sometimes better. But here is the point: ours are not normal times and the homosexual personality is too unstable to withstand the pressures and conflicts inherent in the struggle between East and West.

A Political Problem for Psychologists

IT IS ONE thing to demand the elimination of the homosexuals from Government agencies and another thing to really eliminate them. Unless the screening is done by careful and experienced psycologists, it will result in ludicrous errors such as homosexual family fathers getting away with it while honest-to-God bachelors come under suspicion.

There is another reason why careful experienced psychologists are the essence. It is that homosexuality has many gradations, and that the security risks they represent vary. It would be unfair to throw them all into the same pot, but it needs an expert to tell the harmless from the dangerous ones.

At best the elimination of homosexuals from Government agencies is only one phase of combatting the homosexual invasion of American public life. Another phase, more important in the long run, is the matter of public education. This should be clear to anyone who views with dismay the forbearance bordering on tenderness with which American society not only tolerates the infiltration of homosexuals everywhere but even allows them to display their perversion in public.

Thus it happened that a male writer dared to present a beautiful young man as "my bride" to a couple of respectable dowagers without anything untoward arising. The silly old girls gushed over "my bride" as if she were Princess Margaret Rose.

Is this, one wonders, the insane imprudence of a civilization which no longer defends its principles? It would seem rather a deplorable ignorance concerning the facts of the matter. That's where education could do a great deal. Then too parents and teachers should be enlightened about the psychological, emotional, physiological symptoms of homosexuality. This is important in view of the fact that many cases of homosexuality can be cured when treated by a skilled psychologist at an early stage.

An Educational Task

However, the chief educational task would be to combat the "love-and-let-love" line which, peddled by the pseudo-liberal fringe, claims that sexual preversion does not prevent a man from functioning normally in all other contexts and that it was just like Senator McCarthy to "persecute" the poor dears in the State Department. This line is fatal in that it lulls society into a false sense of security. It fools homosexuals themselves.

It fools them by instilling in them the notion that there is nothing wrong with the satisfaction of their abnormal desires and that it is, indeed, the solution of the homosexual problem. That this is by no means the case is demonstrated by the unhappiness under which most homosexuals (even the most successful among them) labor. In fact, if proof were needed of the high price paid by those who violate the Divine Laws, that dark melancholy unhappiness which is so characteristic of the homosexuals would be it. Actually, license acerbates the homosexual problem both for society and for the individual. Its solution lies just in the opposite direction—namely, in the practice of the admirable art of self-control and resignation.

ORDER BLANK

Send me _____ reprints of "HOMOSEXUAL INTERNATIONAL" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles add 1c per copy; for airmail add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

IF YOU LIKE THIS ARTICLE . . . . You should subscribe to HUMAN EVENTS, the weekly Washington Newsletter, reporting to 40,000 business and political leaders on politics, labor, taxes and business. HUMAN EVENTS will tell you each week the news behind the news from the Nation's Capital. TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: $1 for 5 weeks. One year: $12.50. YOUR MONEY BACK IF DISSATISFIED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED